

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 6, 14, 21, 28 and 35 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations from any intervening claims.

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-20, 22-27, 29-34 and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fadem et al. In the “Response to Arguments” section of the final office action, the office action indicates that the preamble language is not given any patentable weight. As to independent claims 1, 16, and 30, Applicant respectfully notes that the claims require, among other things, that the insertion data is inserted to prevent interception of the incoming data. As such, filtering received incoming data includes filtering of the data that is inserted to prevent interception of the incoming data to determine which data is actual versus which data has been inserted to prevent interception of the incoming data. Such a method or apparatus or structure is not taught or suggested by the cited reference. For example, Applicant notes that, among other advantages, Applicant’s method and apparatus can prevent keyboard sniffing applications and other applications attempting to intercept messages from a message queue of a particular application by inserting, for example, fake messages. Such a system may be independent of an operating system. The Fadem reference is not directed to such a system.

The Fadem reference is directed to a link flow control system that uses link flow control commands that control the flow of information between a host device and a terminal element. The office action cites column 12, lines 45-52, lines 54-66 as well as lines 33-52. However, the 8 bit data described in Fadem does not prevent interception but instead contains keystroke data and link flow command characters and an identification bit. As such, the link flow command characters are actual and legitimate data as is the ID bit. Since none of the data bits of the 8 bit data bits prevent the interception of incoming data, they are not the

claimed insertion data. In fact, it does not appear that Fadem discloses any insertion data to prevent the interception of incoming data as claimed. To the contrary, the Fadem reference appears to teach that the information that is sent is legitimate information and is used by the receiving device. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

In addition, the dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter and accordingly, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

As to claims 10 and 24, it appears that Applicant's previous remarks may not have been fully appreciated. As previously noted, these claims require, among other things, storing a list of data representing data to be randomized and selecting data from the list as the random insertion data. As such, the claim requires random insertion data as well as providing the selected insertion data for insertion as part of the incoming data. The office action cites to columns 18 and 19. However, the cited section does not describe any random insertion data or a list of data's random insertion data. The cited portions of this reference again merely appear to teach that standard operations using flags is performed by the Fadem system. For example, the program determines if an LFC flag has been set and if so, a check is made to determine if the HRQ contents is less than eight. There does not appear to be any discussion, teaching or suggestion of any randomization or random insertion data or data representing data to be randomized. Accordingly, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Their associated dependent claims are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons above and in addition, are respectfully submitted as adding additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. Accordingly, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the

Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 1, 2004

By:   
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005